AN ANALYSIS OF THE CONTENT OF BLOCK FIELD WORK IN GROUP WORK AND COMMUNITY ORGANIZATION FOR THE YEARS 1941-43

A THESIS

SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF THE ATLANTA UNIVERSITY SCHOOL OF SOCIAL WORK

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR

THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF SOCIAL WORK

BY

MARY ALICE NORMAND

ATLANTA, GEORGIA

MAY 1944

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Significance of the Study

It is an accepted practice of schools of Social Work to require students to take field work training in one or more of the accepted methods of Social Work. "Field work is recognized as an integral part of the preparation for practice in a particular area. It is a course of instruction offered in case work, group work and community organization through practice in a social agency setting under the guidance and supervision of selected field work agencies."[1] There is some disagreement as to the value of such procedure, nevertheless Social Work has regarded this type of apprenticeship as a major source of training. The goals of the field work process are defined by Porter R. Lee and Marion E. Kenworthy as follows:

> To provide an opportunity for the development of skill through practice in the use of its several ingredients: knowledge, philosophy, and technique.
>
> To develop in students the ability to discern in actual situations and in human beings facts and concepts with which they have become intellectually familiar through study.
>
> To provide the test of practicality for theories and methods with which students have become familiar.[2]

In any of the selected methods, field work parallels the basic courses in the same area in the curriculum and becomes the focal point at which these and other courses in the curriculum assume an organic relationship to each other and to practice.[3] Field work practice in group work is designed to give the student experience in group leadership, in committee

---

1 Edith Abbott, "Education for Social Work", Social Work Year Book, VI (1939), p. 182.

2 Porter R. Lee, Marion E. Kenworthy, Mental Hygiene and Social Work (New York, 1931), p. 184.

3 Marion Hathway, "Education for Social Work", Social Work Year Book, VI (1941) p. 182.

participation, and in administrative procedures in group work agencies. In both group work and community organization, field practice is frequently much less standardized than in case work.[1] Although the correlation of classroom experience and field experience is regarded as valid educationally for the potential group and community worker, these agencies have been slow in delineating the entire content of acceptable field work as to the type or the intensity of training this field work should provide.

Schools of Social Work likewise, show great differences in emphasis. Some deal with specific and drastic problems. In others it is felt that the student in training for group work and community organization should have a variety of experiences which will orient him to the different aspects of the professional activities of social workers in a community or group work setting.[2] The schools of social work have various practices in the field work requirements. Most of the schools of the American Association of Schools of Social Work which offer group work, employ the type of field work in which classroom theory is given along with practical training in the same community where the school is located. A few schools have field work on a block basis which may be performed either in an agency in the same community where the school is located or in another community. This latter type of field work provides no classroom work for the student during the practice period. The Atlanta University School of Social Work offers both types of field work. Faced with a constantly increasing enrollment and an insufficient number of agencies and supervisors in the Atlanta community, the out-of-the-city block field work practice was initiated by the

---

1 Grace Coyle, "Generic Aspects of Professional Training", National Conference of Social Work, VI (New York, 1940), 610-11.

2 Grace Coyle, op. cit., p. 611.

Atlanta University School of Social Work.[1]

The school realized a need and endeavored to maintain the same standards in the selection of agencies and supervisors of training in the out-of-the-city block field work program as it did in the concurrent field work provided in the Atlanta community. However, the selection of desirable field work centers, where an opportunity for a learning experience can be assured, requires a close relationship between the school and agencies in the various areas of Social Work. Administrative arrangements and suitable work loads are not easily developed and requires a high degree of cooperation and understanding on both sides. An additional problem is the changing nature of Social Work and the necessity of maintaining a practice experience for students which assures them a content that is applicable in a variety of situations.[2] Consequently, in making the selection of agencies the school has adopted the policy of having a member of its teaching staff visit the various agencies from time to time to observe and interview the personnel in order to obtain some idea of the agencies's facilities, policies, and methods employed in the supervision of field work students.[3] The criteria used by members of the American Association of Schools of Social Work in selecting agencies suitable for field work placements are set forth by Hathway:

> Criteria for the selection of agencies include the professional standing of the agency, the interest of the agency in the future development of its own staff, acceptance of a share in the training of future social workers, established personnel practices, satisfactory physical facilities to permit the placement of students, and quality and extent of suitable supervisory personnel.

---

1 Atlanta University School of Social Work, Bulletin, (Atlanta, 1940-41), p. 35.

2 Marion Hathway, "Education for Social Work", Social Work Year Book VI (New York, 1937), p. 148.

3 Statement by Forrester B. Washington, Director, Atlanta University School of Social Work, personal interview, July 21, 1943.

> Criteria used in the selection and approval of field supervisors include the certificate or degree from an accredited two-year school of Social Work as professional equipment, eligibility or capacity for teaching in the supervisor-teacher relationship. Exceptions are made, where they are necessary, to assure an adequate variety in practice and competent supervision of students.[1]

Likewise, as much consideration is given to the selection of students for field work assignments as there is to the selection of agencies and supervisors, because the school realizes that individual differences in personality, ability and emotional development must be recognized in order to make the most satisfactory placements. "This selection is done either by an individual advisor or by the faculty as a whole." In either instance there are certain qualities that are taken into consideration which include; the student's academic achievement, emotional maturity, his experience before entering school, and the type of student desired by the agency. The student selected for block field work must have had at least one semester's theory in the basic courses of Social Work and must have displayed to the satisfaction of his instructors an understanding of the principles inherent in the fundamental courses. Emotional maturity of the student is ascertained by his attitude toward his studies, his adjustment in the school community, his relationships with fellow-students and instructors, and his wholesome acceptance of any limitations of ability and personality he may have. The director of the school states that he is often requested by agencies to place a field work student under their supervision having special qualifications. In some instances, agencies have specified that they prefer a student who has had some practical experience in Social Work prior to his

---

1 Marion Hathway, "Education for Social Work", Social Work Year Book VI, (1941),p. 183.

2 Forrester B. Washington, "Block Field Work", Annual Report (Atlanta, 1943), p. 5.

term of apprenticeship in the agency. In other cases, an agency might request a student who has special skills or one who has certain physical attributes or personal characteristics. It is not an unusual occurance for an agency to request the school to send them a student who has a very light or very dark complexion because he will fit in better with the agency's personnel or clientele.[1]

The individual students know at least three weeks before their departure from the school, the specific agency to which they will be assigned during the approaching semester. During this intervening period between notification and their departure to assignment, the students are provided specific information orienting them to the nature of block field work training. Such information includes the method of reporting to the school supervisor, the agency's program, and other matters which experience has proved are important for the student to know before he begins his block field work training.[2]

The student trainee receives no renumeration for his services in the agency although a few exceptional organizations provide free living quarters within the agency. Generally, however, the field work student is expected to provide his own maintenance elsewhere in the community.[3]

The Purpose of This Study

Despite the conscientious efforts made by the Atlanta University School of Social Work to maintain the highest standards in placing its students

---

1 Statement by Forrester B. Washington, Director, Atlanta University School of Social Work, personal interview, July 21, 1943.

2 Forrester B. Washington, "Block Field Work", Annual Report (Atlanta, 1943), p. 6.

3 Ibid.

for their practical training period, it has not made a specific evaluation of the experiences of the students on a collective basis. It has therefore, been unable to draw definite conclusions concerning the content of the average student's experience in any area. While there is a general agreement among professional schools of Social Work as to the nature of the content in group work and community organization apprenticeships, variations in length of time, in emphasis of activities and in the nature of the supervision are indicated.

Consequently, the purpose of this study is to analyze the records of students who performed block field work under supervision in group work and community organization agencies; to ascertain the type and emphases of activities included in training; to interpret the findings in the light of accepted practices in the field of group work and community organization.

The study is not an attempt to set up standards or to determine the various types of supervision but to ascertain the content of field work experience.

Scope of the Study

The Atlanta University School of Social Work during the period 1941 through 1943 has placed students in a total of 31 group work and community organization agencies. These include 1 Training School for Boys, 2 Community Centers, 2 Tuberculosis Associations, 8 Urban Leagues, 5 Young Women's Christian Associations, 7 Young Men's Christian Associations,and 6 Social Settlements. These field work centers are located in a geographical area extending as far East as New York City, as far North as Cleveland, Ohio, as far South as New Orleans, Louisiana and as far West as Denver,

Colorado.[1]

The study is concerned with every phase of the professional development of the student in group work and community organization, which includes activities performed in the agency under supervision, research work and community contacts required by supervisors, and activities performed on the student's own volition. Consideration is also given to obstacles and specific problems experienced by the student during the training period.

In analyzing the field work records comprised of reports from supervisors, the students' interpretation of activities, contacts, and participation in administrative detail, certain allowances must be made for individual differences in recording. Although a standard outline was required as far as possible, it must be recognized that some individuals are naturally more inclined toward giving detailed and accurate reports than others. Brevity, carelessness or lack of detail somewhat limit the picture other reports convey.

The Method Used in Making the Study

The author selected at random four field work records. Two of these were in the area of group work and two in the area of community organization. After reading these over carefully an outline was made of specific items included in the records i.e., community contacts, personal counseling, number of groups. This outline was then mimeographed in the form of a schedule in which a series of blanks preceeded each item. A schedule was made for each field work record. Each record was read carefully and as certain items appeared they were checked on the schedule.

Interviews were then held with some of the students and faculty members

---

[1] Atlanta University School of Social Work, Bulletin (Atlanta, 1940-41), p. 35.

of the Atlanta University School of Social Work. After making some research of certain books and documents by authorities and writers in the professional field of group work and community organization, the author attempted to analyze and give some interpretation to the material recorded on the schedules and to present specific conclusions derived from the findings.

CHAPTER II

THE ORIENTATION PROCESS

The 31 agencies employed a variety of orientation procedures with the 58 students included in the analysis. Orientation is described as the "process of placing oneself in right relation to unfamiliar conditions".[1] It is a process that each block field work student experiences. He is thrust into a strange environment and has to make an adjustment to a new situation. Despite the efforts made by the Atlanta University School of Social Work to prepare the student for this experience, the data reveal that most of them acknowledged in their reports that there was a certain newness about the situation that was confusing. Lindenburg points out that this is not an unusual occurance and that most new workers experience this feeling of insecurity in the beginning. "Often routine duties in the everyday scheme of things seem almost too much to cope with and his relationship with other members of the staff are a source of worry".[2] For this reason many supervisors require participation in special activities which will help the student to become adjusted.[3]

The records reveal that students from the Atlanta University School of Social Work were initiated in various manners to their field work programs. In some cases the process was so effective that the student was able to approach his new responsibilities with a feeling of confidence. In other instances it was so inadequate that the student remained insecure and

---

1 Thomas Brown, The Winston Simplied Dictionary for Schools (Philadelphia, 1936).

2 Sidney Lindenburg, Supervision in Social Group Work (New York, 1939), p. 5.

3 Paul Super, Training A Staff (New York, 1920), p. 7.

continued to face problems with which he could not cope. Such problems probably presented themselves because the limitation of the student's function and the boundaries of his responsibilities were not clearly defined during the first weeks of his practice period.

Most of the students were required to participate during the orientation period in one or more of the following activities: planned and casual interviews, supervisory conferences, staff meetings, observation of groups and the reading and discussion of material pertinent to the community and the program of the agency. An analysis of the data indicates a variation in emphasis of these activities and the significance of them in helping the student adjust himself was diverse. However, the aim of these activities was to introduce the student to the community, the agency's program and his particular responsibility. Table 1, page 46, in the appendix shows the classification of orientation experiences.

The Initial Interview and The Conference

There was an usual endeavor on the part of supervisors to be available for an initial interview when the student arrived at the agency where he was to perform field work, "A newly arrived student needs to know certain things about the agency: the history and personnel of the agency and what it has been trying to accomplish: the department's facilities, its current program, and some of its problems and handicaps".[1] Many of these things were discussed in the first interview between student and supervisor. Likewise, much of this information was imparted to the student through the initial supervisory conference. The school recognized the value of the conference and requested that each agency include it as a major part of the student's

---

[1] Margaretta Brereton, The General Secretary of a Community YWCA (New York,1943), p. 71.

program.

> The supervisor's conference with the student is a separate matter and affords the more intimate knowledge of the student's ability, problems, and needs. This latter should be planned for at regular intervals. The nature of the content of such supervisory conferences may be the result of observation of the student's work with a specific group, a narrative record presented by the worker, or a definite request on the part of the student for help on a specific problem.[1]

TABLE 2

NUMBER OF STUDENTS PARTICIPATION IN SUPERVISORY CONFERENCES AND FREQUENCY OF SUCH CONFERENCES

Frequency of Conferences	Number of Students
Total	58
Once a Week	19
*	
Once a Week and When Necessary	24
Before Each New Project	2
Twice a Week	9
No Record	4

*"When necessary" is used to denote conferences that were held upon the request of either student or supervisor when confronted with a specific problem.

The records indicate that students were exposed to both the regular and informal type of conference. In the larger Social Settlements, Urban Leagues and Community Centers the informal conference was not used as wide-16 as it was by agencies having a smaller personnel. In most of the YWCA's and YMCA's students had greater access to their supervisors and were able to have short periods of consultation almost daily. In this way occasions presented themselves for the supervisor to commend the student on certain achievements, opportunities arose to discuss particular problems: maladjustment to community traditions, failure to understand certain personalities and inadequate comprehension of responsibilities. There was also an

---

[1] Frankie Adams, A Suggestive Guide to Agency Supervisors of Students in Group Work (Atlanta, 1942), p. 2.

opportunity to discuss material concerning the agency and articles and books pertinent to the student's particular duties. According to a theory set forth by Lindenburg, "a chief function of the conference was to give the supervisor a chance to discover the student's attitude toward democratic group work methods".[1]

Group work and community organization agency supervisors realized that to do a good job it was necessary for the student to "know the backgrounds, customs, and prejudices of the people with whom he expected to work". While a true understanding of one's environment is thought to be a long and continued process[2] at least a part of this information was imparted to the student through the earlier supervisory conference. The 58 students included in the analysis came from various sections of the country;[3] very often the customs of the community in which their field work was performed were widely divergent from their own. In such cases it was vitally important that they obtain knowledge of the people they expected to serve. The recorded data indicate that many supervisors were conscious of this need. Some of them gave a description of matters of race, nationality, occupations, economic and social levels. The student was then given an opportunity to visit other agencies in order to get acquainted with the workers, their methods and their programs. Permitting new workers to secure knowledge on their own resources is accepted as a valuable practice[4] and was especially significant to students practicing in the field of community organization.

---

1 Sidney Lindenburg, Supervision in Social Group Work (New York, 1939), p. 38.

2 J. F. Steiner, Community Organization (New York and London, 1925), p. 379.

3 Atlanta University School of Social Work, Bulletin (Atlanta, 1940-41), p. 14.

4 op. cit., p. 23.

> Whatever social problems we confront as community workers, whatever persons come into our field of view, the first questions involved will always be: To what group do these persons belong? What are the interests of these groups? What sort of means do the group use to promote their interests? These questions go to the tap root of all social interpretation whether in the case of historical events far in the past or of the most practical problems of our own neighborhood.[1]

The Staff Meeting

Like the supervisory conference, participation in the regular staff meetings of the agency was included in the program of the field work students upon the request of the school and constituted a major part of training.[2] "As a method of initiating the new worker, the staff meeting is considered indespensable".[3] The data indicate that each of the 58 students performing field work was given an opportunity to participate in the staff meetings of the agency. Usually this was used not only as an orientation measure but as a regular activity throughout the practice period. The staff meeting helped the student understand his position in the agency in relation to other staff members. He was given an opportunity to talk over problems with them and to get their opinion. Through an interchange of ideas he was able to broaden his professional vision in accordance with the theory that staff meetings often function as a study group.[4] The agenda the students sent to the school included some of these features: a worship service, discussion of some phase of the agency's program as it

---

1 A. W. Small, General Sociology (Chicago, 1894), p. 495.

2 Frankie Adams, Field Work Manual (Atlanta, 1937), p. 4.

3 Margaretta Brereton, The General Secretary of a Community YWCA. (New York, 1940), p. 73.

4 op. cit.

related to a local situation, e.g., religion, race relations, the labor movement, consideration of community problems and resources. In other cases they included: discussion of agency policies, reports of staff members on their work; reports on conferences, reviews of pertinent books and articles. Such activities served to give the student a feeling of solidarity with the movement.

Although the majority of students used the staff meetings in an effective manner to contribute to their professional growth, the records reveal that some of them showed a negative attitude in availing themselves of this particular opportunity. One field work supervisor states in a letter written to the school in regard to a student under her guidance:

> Although opportunity was made for the student to participate in the regular staff meetings, she never took the initiative in asking questions and leading discussions. Miss W's position as the only student from a Negro school put her in a position to make appreciable contributions but she did not do so.

On the other hand the student's report suggests that she derived a dirth of information about the agency and the local situation through these meetings. The passive attitude might have been due to a feeling of insecurity because this student was the only Negro in the group which was a fairly large one. A number of students have admitted in their confidential letters to the school supervisor that they felt timid or "nervous" and hesitated to express themselves. Whatever the reasons are that lie behind the lack of participation, Lindenburg states that it is a problem that many supervisors face in working with students as well as with new staff members;

> Staff members are just as lethargic in matters calling for active participation as the general mass of the public. Leaders usually are willing to try democratic process in their groups but, as group members, themselves, they show little desire to be active, cooperative individuals. As cogs in the machinery of the agency, they almost show a desire to be driven. They almost fight against opportunities offered to them to cooperate in sharing responsibility,

> yet, no group worker can help others take their place as cooperating, participating, responsible group members who cannot himself, be a part of a truly democratic group.[1]

In contrast to this example is another student who assumed responsibility and made an appreciable contribution as a participating member. She identified herself so well with the other members of the staff and made such an excellent contribution to the agency's program that "at a formal meeting, the entire staff rose in a body to pay her tribute".[2]

These examples are typical of perhaps two extremes. The records indicate that the average student falls somewhere between the two. In most cases the staff meeting proved to be of keen significance in helping the student find his right relation to the agency program because as Brereton states "most of the essential principles and practices of group work are implicit in the content and method of conducting the staff meeting".[3] To the students who entered upon their duties in the fall of the year the "setting up" conference was helpful. In a "setting up conference", the agency's programs for the year is usually planned and outlined by the staff members and specific objectives are set up. Each staff member is able to gain an understanding of his specific responsibilities. Likewise, such a conference helps to crystalize in the mind of the field work student the agency expectancy and to define the boundaries of his function in relation to the other personnel.

Observation of Activities

Another emphasis during the orientation period was the observation

---

[1] Sidney Lindenburg, Supervision in Social Group Work (New York, 1939), pp. 117-118.

[2] Letter from Field Work Supervisor.

[3] op. cit., p. 74.

of activities going on in the agency by the field work student. In the agencies having a larger personnel and providing more group activities, the period of observation was much longer and naturally of more significance in helping students to become adjusted. In the smaller YW or YMCA's, where the personnel was small this was not given as much emphasis. In the former instance, however, many students were not assigned definite responsibilities for two or three weeks and most of this time was spent in the capacity of an observer. Generally, reading material was assigned during this period which was pertinent to the agency's historical background, policies, and the nature of its work. Such material was usually discussed with the supervisor in a conference.

Students performing field work in Tuberculosis Associations were allowed to use the first two or three weeks in making community contacts and in gaining information about it. These were also given reading assignments pertinent to the agency and the community.

The fundamental purpose of all these activities during the early stage of the field work training was to help the student develop security and to "aid him in helping himself".[1]

---

[1] Paul Super, Training A Staff (New York, 1920), p. 122.

CHAPTER III

THE STUDENT AS A GROUP WORKER

The Atlanta University School of Social Work has requested that each field work student practicing in group work agencies be assigned definite club responsibility as a part of training. Because of the brevity of the practice period of four months, the agencies have been urged to provide their own permanent group leadership. The student has been expected to assume the role of a "director of activities for these groups, an observer of the processes of organization, and the integrator of interests toward certain desirable ends".[1]

In accordance with this request, the analysis reveals that usually after the first two or three weeks in the agency, the student was given definite group assignments which remained a major emphasis during the period. In a few agencies specializing in community organization, such assignments were not possible and the student's contact with groups was not as definite. In the former instance, however, the relationship of the student to the groups was either directional, participatory, or observatory. In the first type, the student was primarily an educator. It was his responsibility to employ "educational understanding"[2] and through democratic practice, set an example for the indigenous leaders and to provide a desirable pattern for members of the group. Generally, the student was assigned to two groups; one adult and one junior, or in some cases, two junior and two adult. In this way he was able to have contact

---

1 Frankie Adams, Field Work Manual (Atlanta, 1937), p. 5.

2 Joshua Lieberman, "Club Work Aims and Progressive Education," Christian Citizenship (New York, n.d.), p. 6.

with people of various ages and to apply his skills, knowledge and group work theories. The study reveals that it was this area of the student's experience that required the most supervision.

In the student's effort to utilize his skills and abilities to direct the activities of the group in more effective cooperation, his task was not always an easy one to perform. It was necessary for him to know his groups, the purposes that actuated the members in forming the club, the interests they had in common, their ability to function as a group and their readiness for democratic procedure. Certain groups seemed to know what they wanted from the start, very often the club was a clique that already had many interests in common and a background of friendships. Such a group is more homogeneous and it was fairly easy for the student to receive an interpretation of it from the supervisor or from written records. These required little help from the student during the first few weeks other than his care that their "sense of self dependence" was not interfered with and that the club environment was made favorable to further group effort and to the broadening of purpose.[1]

Other groups had no outstanding interests and required the student's aid in finding a starting point. Often the members were delinquent children who frequented a settlement house or community center and had serious personality problems.

Still other groups were entirely helpless and expected the student, like their teacher at school, to tell them exactly what to do. It was in these last two cases that most students found it difficult to bridge the gap between theory and practice.

---

[1] Joshua Lieberman, "Club Work Aims and Progressive Education", Christian Citizenship (New York, /n.d./), p. 3.

Some of the difficulty was due to the approach by the student to the group. In other instances the approach and attitude of the untrained group leader caused the difficulty. Variety in group classification or stage of progress suggests the nature of leadership required. Among the categories of leaders in which group workers are interested are those of Bogardus, Busch, and Pigors. They are used to indicate the manner in which the leader influences his followers and the type of relationship that is established and maintained. DuVall described these relationships as autocratic or master, educator or didactic, democratic, paternalistic or partial.[1] It was possible to classify some of the students according to this description but others shifted their methods from time to time and are classified as the "mixed" type.

Democratic leadership implies helping the members of the group to select both the goals, and the means for their attainment. Inherent in the democratic process is the idea that the leader accepts responsibility, not only for the successful attainment of the common goals, but also for the welfare of his followers,"for their protection from both physical and psychological dangers".

> In using the democratic group work method the leader is a member of the group he leads and is accepted as such by the other members. Because of his superior knowledge and skills and his greater maturity, he is in a position to serve as a resource person, to stimulate them to activities by which they may achieve goals of their own choosing in the light of factual information provided by him. Because of appropriate personality qualities, he is able to influence the attitudes and behavior of the other members of the group; but he permits them within certain limits to make mistakes and to suffer the consequences of their own decisions as a part of the learning process by which they may achieve competent independence.[2]

---

1 Everett DuVall, Personality and Social Group Work (New York, 1943), p. 90.

2 op. cit., p. 205.

Essentially, this is the type of group leadership the Department of group work at the Atlanta University School of Social Work has recommended to its students. Most of the students included in this study attempted to use a degree of the democratic approach. The failure on the part of a few, may have been due to an over anxiety to have their groups "show some achievement" during the limited period of contact.

The autocratic type of group leadership is one that is held in disdain by authorities in the field. Only three students could be classified as having a distinct tendency to employ this type of leadership. Two of these were helped in this area of their development through the supervisory conference and suggestions from the school supervisor of group work. One student, however, continued to use an autocratic approach to his groups and due to a resentful attitude towards his supervisor showed no change or improvement during the period. In regard to such methods DuVall states:

> As an educational process that seeks to develop the personalities of the members and to obtain social goals through joint action of leaders and followers, social group work has no place for the autocrat or dictator type of person. Here the objectives of group action are arbitrarily chosen by the dictator or autocrat in his own self interest. There is no sharing, no feeling of joint action and no attempt to give the "subjects" an understanding of either the objectives or the methods of their attainment. The dictator assumes his role, dogmatically asserting his personal superiority and self-sufficiency, and maintaining his position through an organizational set up that creates a wide social gap between himself and his subjects. He achieves their subordination through coercion and their obedience through fear. His own interests are always paramount. He wants immediate results rather than achievements from a long term view. To this end his us subjects are regimented to insure prompt obedience and immediate results.[1]

Occasionally a student who employed the democratic method himself, was faced with the problem of an autocratic type of volunteer or natural group leader. When the latter was an adult, frequently the student was timid about pointing out that superimposing standards is not accepted as good

---

[1] Ibid., pp. 191-92.

group procedure. Such was the case of one student who was faced with this problem.

> Mrs.__, the club leader, seems really to be interested in the club, but I think she is too strict on the members. Like Hitler, "she rules with an iron rod". When she says anything she doesn't like for it to be commented upon but wants it accepted regardless to what the members think. I try to change her view point on this when we have little discussions by suggesting that club members have a right to freedom of thought and speech. When we have our next cabinet meeting our guest speaker will speak on club procedure. I thought I would ask Mrs.___to attend. Would you please suggest some other means by which I could convince her that club leadership does not mean ruling like Hitler, without insulting her.[1]

Obviously this student faced a double problem; that of interpreting the democratic technique and in guarding against the danger of usurping the leader's role in his desire to insure progress for the group.

The "partial" approach is one in which the leader tends to devote a disproportionate amount of time to a few members in a group. Two students seemed to have this attitude at the outset of the practice period. One of these worked with a "class" type of group interested in crafts and seemed to devote more of her time to the more skilled members. Lindenburg points out that many group workers tend to lose sight of good group work principles when they work with groups of this type because they feel that the more accomplished members are worthy of more time, praise and attention.[2]

Conducting Mass Activity

Many agencies housing game rooms and providing recreation grounds are open to any and all individuals desiring to use them. Because the members of various clubs affiliated with the agency as well as other individuals

---

[1] Letter from Field Work Students.

[2] Sidney Lindenburg, Supervision in Social Group Work (New York, 1939), p. 101.

unattached to any group are allowed to use the game room or play ground, there is no such thing as a permanent enrollment.[1] There is great variance in the age of the participants. A playground, for example, may handle all age groups with different backgrounds and no common interests other than a desire for recreation.[2] Agencies providing for mass recreation of this type generally give the field work student an opportunity to conduct some of these activities aside from regular club assignments.

According to the data, a few of the field work students were able to transfer the same group work principles employed with their clubs to work with these larger groups. One student performing field work at a Settlement House did an "excellent" job of using his own athletic skill in conducting basket ball tournaments and many games which brought members of various clubs together. At the same time he was able to discover the interests of some of the individuals and to recruit them for membership in one of the clubs under his supervision. He was able, on the playground, to have short informal interviews with individual participants and thus, came to know many of the children on an individual basis.

All too frequently, however, students seemed to approach these larger groups with an entirely different attitude to that used with clubs. From their own recorded material the impression is given that mass activity was a thing apart from group work. Often the student merely felt it his duty to "keep order" and "pass out equipment". One student, performing field work at a Settlement House was so concerned about the "checking in" and "checking out" of billiard balls in the game room that most of one report was devoted to this problem. He went so far as to charge each boy five cents per ball, which

---

[1] Ibid., p. 107.

[2] Everett DuVall, Personality and Social Group Work (New York, 1943), p. 15.

was returned to the boy when the ball was turned in. This in itself may have had its virtues but to devote such a disproportionate amount of attention to such a problem and to keeping order is to be questioned as to its field work value in group work. Lieberman states that "disciplinary problems almost always disappear in the presence of purposeful activity".[1] This means that the activity is related to the interests of the participants. Apparently the game room experience was not so related to group interests.

Another student, having no particular skills herself, fell into the role of an observer. She never attempted to discover the interests of any of the participants and was never a part of the inter-action of the group.

The records indicate that on a whole there was very little application of group work theory with these larger heterogeneous groups. Usually the student was interested in "having something going on". Strangely enough, however, there is no indication that there was much supervision in this area and discussion of this phase of the student's work in supervisory conferences was conspicuously absent in the majority of cases. "One of the main aims of supervision is to make group work objectives in all activities more real and vital to the student and to guide him to a clearer understanding of his job".

---

1 Joshua Lieberman, "Club Work Aims and Progressive Education", Christian Citizenship (New York, /n.d./), p. 7.

TABLE 3

SHOWING THE TYPE OF GROUPS SPONSORED BY VARIOUS AGENCIES
THE KIND OF LEADERSHIP EMPLOYED BY STUDENTS AND
THE NUMBER OF STUDENTS USING SUCH METHODS

Type of Agency	No.	Type of Groups	Type of Leadership	No of Students
Social Settlements	6	Club Class Mass	Democratic	31
Community Centers	2	Club Class Mass	Dictatorial	4
Tuberculosis Associations	2	Club Class Mass	Didactic	4
Y. M. C. A.'s	7	Club Class Mass	Autocratic	4
Y. W. C. A.'s	5	Class Club	Partial	
Urban Leagues	8	Club Class Mass	Mixed	12
Training School for Boys	1	Club Class Mass		

CHAPTER IV

SOME IMPLICATIONS FROM CASE WORK

Significance

In recent years authorities and writers in the field of Social Work have agreed that group workers should have an understanding of case work in order to cooperate effectively in the service of persons needing both kinds of assistance. It is important that they understand the philosophy and methods of case work as one means of increasing the efficiency with which they perform their own function, for "case work has implications for group work".[1] Recently much effort has been devoted to bridging the "chasm" created on each side of the "wall" by lack of knowledge and mutual understanding.[2] The aims and purposes of both the case work and the group work field are the same; "furthering the well-being, effectiveness, and happiness of the persons who require their services and improving the physical and social environment."

> In those agencies organized to meet recreational and leisure time needs, both volunteers and professional workers frequently have occasion to render service to one member at a time. Regardless to educational background, however, limited time prohibits him from entering into the same type of relationship with the individual members that is typical of the case work method. But the case work techniques have implications in the methods employed by the group worker in individualizing members. It is, therefore, a practice of many agencies to call services rendered to one member at a time "counseling" or "individual guidance.[3]

Although there has been some disagreement among writers in the field of Social Work as to the need for guidance in the programs of recreation

---

1 Everett DuVall, Personality and Social Group Work (New York, 1942), p. 415.

2 Gertrude Wilson, Group Work and Case Work: Their Relationship and Practice (New York, 1941), pp. 6-11.

3 Everett Duvall, op. cit., p. 66.

or leisure time agencies, Dewey points out that the "play group is one of the primary groups in which early attitudes are developed and the provision of recreational guidance is a paramount responsibility of the group work agency".[1]

There is also an adjustment phase to recreational guidance, for certain individuals need help in modifying their thinking with regard to leisure time activities and in "fitting into" or "getting along" in various play or recreation groups. The social group worker has more professional concern in a sense, with leisure time and recreational guidance than he has with educational or vocational guidance. This concern is not to be treated lightly however, because "play is coming to be recognized as one of the main activities of life and leisure time is becoming more extensive than are work time problems.[2]

An appreciation of the relationship between group work and the more individualized case work method, has prompted many schools of social work whose students specialize in one of the fields, to require courses in the other area of specialization.[3] Students at the Atlanta University School of Social Work are not permitted to specialize and are given generic rather than specialized theory.[4] The students interested in group work and community organization therefore, have the advantages of theory and field work in the case work field and frequently have the opportunity to use this knowledge both in their field work training and in their future employment situations.

---

1 C. H. Cooley, Social Organizations (New York, 1909), p. 24.

2 E. S. Bogardus, Sociology (New York, 1935), p. 203.

3 DuVall, op. cit., p. 203.

4 Atlanta University School of Social Work, Bulletin (Atlanta, 1941-42), p. 29.

Interviewing and Counseling: A Part of Field Work Training

Twenty-three of the field work students included in this analysis did an appreciable amount of interviewing and counseling in connection with their other responsibilities. Frequently students found it necessary to have personal interviews with members, because of some difficulty growing out of the group situation. Personality clashes, tendencies toward passive rather than active participation, non-conformity or too aggressive behavior constituted some of these problems. Some of these problems were situations that the students attempted to meet through the process of counseling. The position of the student in such situations was that of giving the member an interpretation of group work aims and his responsibility toward their realization. Often it was necessary to make home visits and to gather information from the school, juvenile court and case work agency. This additional information gave the student an insight into the total situation and a better approach to the immediate problem.

Recruiting club members and volunteers is not generally conceived of as a counselling situation. Nevertheless, students frequently found it necessary to give guidance to families because of their refusing to permit their children to participate in the agency program. In such situations it was necessary for the field work student to give the parents information about the club and its value as a recreational activity. The significance of meeting these individual problems in this way is set forth by Lieberman. "The value of our work, because of its strategic position in the field of Social Work, can only be measured by the answer to the question: How much have we done for the individual club member".[1]

---

[1] Joshua Lieberman, "Club Work Aims and Progressive Education", Christian Citizenship (New York, 1942), p. 419.

Employment and Referral Services

The analysis reveals that the students who performed field work in the area of community organization did considerably more interviewing and counselling than the students in group work agencies. The nature of the agency's work and the student's major assignments and responsibilities made this necessary. Although Urban Leagues, Health Associations and Co-operative organizations often have group work departments, many also have an employment and referral service. Practice in these specific areas of the agency's work usually constituted a major part of the field work student's program. It was his responsibility to collect information concerning employment vacancies and to make job placements. This practice required skill in interviewing and collecting pertinent information about employment situations. Frequently it involved giving an interpretation of the job a client already held and helping him to establish a better relationship with his employer.

Another function of the student as a counselor was that of referring clients to the agency that could most effectively handle their specific problems. This involved a knowledge of community resources and skill in helping the client define his need. Rendering services of this type provided many opportunities for the student to employ the case work technique.

Research Investigation

Only four students were required to participate in making a survey or performing research investigation. However, all of them used the interview and the case work approach in securing the desired information. The difference between their procedure and the ones used by the other students

in counselling with individuals was that the "research" students were interested in facts about a general problem rather than in the particular persons interviewed. However, this again necessitated knowledge about the agency's program and skill in establishing rapport" with the persons interviewed in a house-to-house campaign. The chief aim of the student was to discover the recreational interests of the people in the community and to determine to what extent the agency could meet these needs.

Medical Interpretation

The three students who received field work training under the supervision of Tuberculosis and Health Associations found opportunities in which to counsel with both individuals and groups in order to give information about the agency's program. Very often the persons in need of its services were ignorant of the significance of skin tests, X-rays, inoculations and other types of medical processes in diagnosing and combating disease.

One student worked with a family in which tuberculosis was prevalent. Because of certain convictions founded on an "Apostolic" religious faith, the parents would not permit the children to receive medical treatment which they so badly needed. The field work student found it necessary to counsel with the parents, point out the hazards of the disease and to explain the nature of the medical care necessary in the situation. In this way the parents gained information and an insight into the value of the type of medical treatment the agency offered.

Regardless to the types of situations that required the student to render service as an interviewer or counselor, the practice in terms of professional growth is considered a valuable one by DuVall:

Both volunteers and professional workers in the field of Social Work are constantly being confronted with situations in which this skill can be used to advantage. Understanding of the process and mastery of the techniques of interviewing and counselling are important elements in the professional equipment of workers who seek to achieve modern objectives.[1]

TABLE 4

SHOWING THE TYPES OF SERVICES RENDERED ON AN INDIVIDUAL BASIS AND THE NUMBER OF STUDENTS RENDERING SUCH SERVICES

Type of Service	Number of Students
Total	58
Personal Counselling	23
Referral Service	3
Employment Service	7
Medical Interpretation	2
Research Investigation and Surveys	4
None	17

[1] Everett DuVall, Personality and Social Group Work (New York, 1943), p. 142.

CHAPTER V

ROUTINE DUTIES AND RELATED ACTIVITIES

A part of every social worker's task is the routine duties and miscellaneous activities that arise as natural by-products of work with individuals or with groups. The routine aspect of field work training is conceived of as exposure to all office machinery, learning to use the files, making a membership card file, use of the mimeograph and typewriter. Some schools of social work feel that no special time should be set aside for these particular activities "because the student will learn the use of office equipment in the course of regular activity in the agency". Likewise, some schools do not expect the field work student to devote any part of his time to telephone or information desk duty.[1] It has not been possible for the Atlanta University School of Social Work to ignore this requirement due to "the lack of office employees and staff in the agency".[2] It has not, however, expected field work students to be left in charge of the agency for long intervals or to spend a disproportionate amount of time rendering information service. Despite the request of the school that not more than 25 per cent of the trainee's time be spent performing routine duties and office work, a few agencies place considerable more emphasis on this aspect of training. One student performing field work in a YMCA, devoted practically his entire period to answering the telephone and giving out information. He was given very little opportunity to work with groups. Three students were required to sell soda water as a part of office responsibility. The majority of students, however, were allowed to spend

---

1 Frankie Adams, Field Work Manual (Atlanta, 1937), p. 3.

2 Ibid.

most of their time in what the school considers two needed training activities; reading, and record keeping.[1]

Reading

Every student did some reading during the practice period. In most instances reading assignments were discussed in conference with the supervisor or in meetings with other staff members. Frequently, however, the only reference made to such assignments was in the student's report to the school. Lindenburg feels that assignments that are not followed through by the supervisor are of little value.[2] Other writers maintain that a person truly interested in his profession would be eager to add to his store of professional knowledge although he was not to be checked on by a person in authority. Super states, for example, that "A man without a desire for study and an interest in books in his field is loosely anchored in his vocation and probably regards it and himself lightly".[3]

There is not a great range of difference in emphasis placed on reading assignments by field work supervisors but students did vary in the nature of material read. Students in YWCA's were given practically the same assignments which included reports and bulletins of the Association, press clippings, program material, copies of the Woman's Press, a history of the Association and other material pertinent to the agency's program.

The reading program of students in other agencies was more varied although they too were given material concerning the agency's particular

---

1 Frankie Adams, Field Work Manual (Atlanta, 1937), p. 3.

2 Sidney Lindenburg, Supervision in Social Group Work (New York, 1939) p. 20.

3 Paul Super, Training A Staff, (New York, 1937), p. 132.

work. Their reading assignments also included much material about the general community, leadership philosophy and books related specifically to problems concerning the Negro. Most of the reading performed by students voluntarily was for the purpose of securing information needed in working with their special groups.

The practice of reading and study by both students and regular staff members is considered of immense value and is a means of professional growth. "Being real and large, the rewards of well-planned reading are readily recognized; growth in caliber and power, inspiration, broad culture, knowledge, wide vision, a sense of being at home in any group, and increasing skill as a student".[1]

Record Keeping

One of the problem areas of social group work is the lack of adequate records in group work agencies. Authorities in the field and writers interested in making research surveys deplore the scarcity of recorded data available. Unless adequate records are kept the past experiences of an agency as a means of progress and improvement are not likely to be great.[2] In a recent study made of group work agencies in six different cities it was noted that in each case the inadequacy of the records hindered the workers making comparisons and drawing conclusions--thus lessening greatly the value of the study.[3] Lieberman states that after reading the report of the committee conducting the study one feels almost justified in saying

---

1 Paul Super, Training A Staff (New York, 1920), p. 124.

2 Saul Bernstien, Grace Coyle and Others, Group Work: Roots and Branches (New York, 1940), p. 31.

3 Joshua Lieberman, "Club Work Aims and Progressive Education" Christian Citizenship (New York, /n.d./), p. 5.

that all group work agencies keep inadequate records".[1] It is felt that much consideration should be given to this problem.

> Case work did not attain the position of a recognized science until it worked out a system of case records to measure the results of case study. Logically, the same holds true of group work. No such method has been worked out in any final formula, but a beginning has been made. It will be improved upon only as rapidly as people working with groups are willing to experiment with writing records, creating them, and improving upon them.[2]

In light, therefore, of the desire to raise standards and to increase the Atlanta University School of Social Work recommended that field work students keep records of all activities engaged in during the training period. Each trainee was required to keep a narrative record which included a schedule of daily activities and a separate account of club work.[3] In instances where the student rendered some case work service he was required to record the nature of the problem and an account of interviews with the client.[4] The types of records on which the students placed the most time and emphasis were the daily schedules and club work activities. The latter type of record is considered to be of immense value in the field of group work.

> Adequate records enable the supervisor to keep in touch with the group and to know about its program. It is a good indicator of the leader's powers of perception and of her development and growth in her capacity as a group leader.
>
> It throws light on the development and adjustment of individual group members.
>
> The leader himself learns through writing down what she observes,

---

1 Joshua Lieberman, "Club Work Aims and Progressive Education" Christian Citizenship (New York, [n.d.]), p. 5.

2 Ruth Perkins, Program Making and Record Keeping (New York, 1931), p. 155.

3 Frankie Adams, A Suggestive Guide to Agency Supervisors of Students in Group Work (Atlanta, 1942), p. 2.

4 Ibid.

> and analyzing it in terms of what it indicated for her way of work. Particularly it helps her to be more objective about her relation to the group.
>
> It provides the best possible basic material for supervisory conferences in that it lays before the supervisor in close relationship, the needs and interests of the group, the special needs and potentialities of the leader and the concern of the sponsoring agency.[1]

The majority of students seemed to take this phase of their responsibility seriously. They included in their records not only minutes of the meetings but also explained the nature of the groups and interaction of the members. A few of the narrative reports however, gave the impression of being a mere cataloging of what happened from the point of view of a student who had no part herself in the interaction of the group. Williamson suggests that "the group worker should indicate what part she took in the process, what suggestions she made and how she made them".[2]

> It is important that the record include some simple statement of the objectives for the meeting and that it indicate what did not happen in relation to those objectives as well as the things that did happen.
>
> The useful narrative comments on individuals in the group and their behavior, noting particularly outstanding evidences of individual agressiveness or withdrawal and of conflicts within the group when they exist.
>
> Problem situations in the group should be noted and method of handling indicated. Group reactions to program, shifts in interest and new leads for further program development should be included.[3]

A few students were too brief in their recording and lacking in analytical detail. Considerably more were too long and disorganized and gave the impression of being written at the last minute before being sent to the school. While it is recognized that the records enabled the school

---

1 Margaret Williamson, Supervision of Group Leaders (New York, 1942), p. 42.

2 Ibid.

3 Ibid., p. 46.

supervisor to evaluate the professional growth of the student through practice, writing records merely for the benefit of another person is not considered the chief aim of the practice. "Records are only important as they serve as an instrument to do a better job with the people with whom the leader is working".[1]

TABLE 5

TYPES OF ACTIVITIES OF WHICH RECORDS WERE KEPT AND NUMBER OF STUDENTS KEEPING SUCH RECORDS

Club Activities	Number of Students	Interviews	*Number of Students	Routine Matters	Number of Students
Meeting Minutes	42	Employment Service	7	Membership Cards	22
Analytical Narratives	37	Referral Service	4	Monthly Reports	8
Attendance Record	37	Family Visits	23	Time Records	54
Committee Work	24	Research Surveys	12	Statistical Reports	11

*Unless the student recorded the nature of the interview or included some details involved, it was not included in this category. It was merely considered as a part of the daily time record.

Advertising: A Related Activity[2]

Growing out of the relationship the students had with clubs and committees was the frequent necessity to publish or give interpretation to the general program of the agency or some specific activity sponsored by the agency. The methods used were letter writing, newspaper articles, pamphlets and posters and public speaking. Usually, letter writing was used to inform people affiliated with the agency when certain meetings were to take place or other information of particular interest to members.

---

1 Margaret Williamson, Supervision of Group Leaders (New York, 1942), p. 43.

2 Table 6, page 48, shows the methods of advertising used by students.

The news articles were used to publish activities sponsored by the agency of public interest. Pamphlets and posters were used for the same purpose as news articles but had the additional value of providing the student with an opportunity to employ talents of drawing, printing or painting. He was able to develop skill in organizing and illustrating material in a manner that would draw the reader's attention to the main point of interest at a glance. Public speaking seemed to have more personal value for the student than any of the other methods of advertising. It game him an opportunity to organize material in such a way that it could be easily verbalized and it helped him to develop confidence and security. As one student said in a letter to her supervisor, "I am taking advantage of every opportunity to work with groups and speak in public as it helps me to overcome my nervous feeling".

It is fortunate that each student was given the opportunity to employ at least one of these tools of advertising for effective methods of publicity are of great value in the promotion of an agency's program.[1]

---

[1] Mary Routzahn, "Publicity and Interpretation in Social Work", Social Work Year Book (1941), p. 455.

CHAPTER VI

PROBLEMS INVOLVED IN THE FIELD WORK PROCESS

Personality Difficulties

At the heart of modern social work philosophy is appreciation for individual differences and the uniqueness of personality. Individuals have different interests, different skills, different intellectual and physical capacities. It is not reasonable then, to expect every student to react to his field work experience in exactly the same way. As Lindenburg suggests, "so much depends on what the student brings to the job".[1] So often, however, supervisors stated in their evaluation to the school at the close of a practice period, that the student under supervision did not show as much of a certain quality as did another student of a previous or concurrent period. Such a statement seems to suggest that these supervisors tended to evaluate field workers according to the accomplishments of another person rather than on growth and development of a particular student's potentialities and abilities.

Despite this practice however, it must be recognized that certain personality difficulties and attitudes did contribute to the failure of some students and their lack of growth under supervision. One student, for example, was extremely obtrusive in matters that should have been of no concern to her. She seemed to be constantly in search of trouble and as a result incurred the ill favor of both supervisor and co-workers. Her extreme inquisitiveness into the affairs of others prevented her from devoting the proper time to orientation activities and in the last weeks of training she found herself far afield of the boundaries of her function.

---

[1] Sidney Lindenburg, Supervision in Social Group Work (New York, 1939), p. 111.

Another problem was the resentful attitude toward supervision manifested by a few students. One trainee, performing field work at a social settlement was in constant conflict with his supervisor. His autocratic attitude was suggestive of a feeling of inferiority and a lack of security. Consequently he found it necessary to do a great deal of boasting which made him unpopular in the agency. Any attempt on the part of the supervisor to help the student realize the necessity of a cooperative attitude was met with resistance and resentment. Lindenburg appreciates the factors which make students and new workers resist supervision:

> The very act of coming to a supervisor, as a more experienced person, for definite assistance causes difficulty for the leader. He does not feel free to express opinions or discuss basic problems. His background is the traditional one that says the pupil must absorb and carry out the teacher's plan. His school experience, his home life, his relationship in the neighborhood and community have all been built on this foundation. Consequently, it is only natural for him to be bewildered and upset when he discovers that in the supervisory process, his supervisor (teacher in his mind) wants to do the listening, and have him to do the talking. He comes to his first conference expecting to be given definite plans on what he shall do with his group, what program he shall offer them, how he shall handle discipline problems. Instead, he finds the supervisor asking him questions, trying to discover his attitudes, wondering about his interests, making him solve his own problems and even getting him to examine some of his own personality traits. All this is an entirely new and unexpected experience. It is very disturbing emotionally. It of course makes him defensive.

It is unfortunate that the student in question did not use this natural resistance in a positive manner toward growth and development for "only as a person can be disturbed and have his ideas stirred and broken up can growth occur".[1]

Another tendency on the part of many students was that of requesting help and suggestions from the school supervisor on specific situations and

---

[1] Sidney Lindenburg, Supervision in Social Group Work (New York, 1939), p. 48.

problems encountered during training. This has several implications. It might indicate a lack of independence on the part of a student to work through his own problems and a desire to depend too much on outside help. It might mean that the relationship between student and agency field work supervisor was not positive enough to insure freedom on the part of the student to present these problems in the supervisory conference. A sense of freedom on the part of the worker is one of the most essential ingredients for a satisfactory relationship. Williamson states that "if the leader tends to tell only those things about her group that are going well it may indicate that she fears disapproval and is, therefore, not free".[1]

Emotional immaturity was a quality exhibited by a few students. One trainee was so infantile in her relationship with groups and with other staff members that the school was asked to withdraw her from the agency. Maturity is defined by DuVall:

> A person may be considered mature when he can face reality, can accept imperfection in himself and others, he can accept both criticism and praise. Maturity implies that a person is fitted for any appropriate action, state and function. Only those persons who are themselves emotionally mature and socially mature can contribute positively to the "growing up" process in which most of the members, children and even adults are involved.[2]

The writer happens to be acquainted with the particular student in question and her attitude in the school community was the same as that indicated by her field work supervisor. Failure of the school to act upon the recommendation of the agency brings the discussion to another theory that schools of Social Work should accept the recommendations of supervisors regarding students in training. "It is only through cooperation between supervisors,

---

[1] Margaret Williamson, Supervision of Group Leaders (New York, 1942), p. 36.

[2] Everett DuVall, Personality and Social Group Work (New York, 1943), p. 199.

agency heads, and schools of social work that we can eliminate the poor candidate from the field and build toward true professional status and true professional standards of work in our agencies".[1]

One recognizes the wisdom of this philosophy but it could not be applied without compromise in the case of field work students. In the first place the period of training was brief. Therefore, supervisors could not really get to know the student as a real person and all the problems and anxieties he faced. A number of students, for example, were handicapped by lack of clothes and money. They were unable therefore, to present themselves in the same favorable light as more fortunate individuals. A lack of tidiness then on the part of students did not necessarily indicate that they would be untidy in a renumerative situation. Even in the daze of immaturity "satisfactions can come from doing a good job as a group leader, and that satisfaction so derived can contribute constructively to a leader's total adjustment. It is in this area that the supervisor can help directly and with assurance".[2]

Lack of initiative on the part of the student was another criticism that a number of supervisors offered. All too often the trainee did only what was absolutely required of him. Whenever opportunities presented themselves for the student to attend and benefit from certain lectures, civic affairs and activities of a social welfare nature, many times he took advantage of every excuse for not attending. After reading such reports one questions the real interest on the part of some students in social work.

---

1 Sidney Lindenburg, Supervision in Social Group Work (New York, 1939), p. 56.

2 Margaret Williamson, Supervision of Group Leaders (New York, 1942), p. 38.

Lack of Facilities and Staff

Limited facilities and staff were problems faced by a number of students and supervisors.[1] This was true especially in the smaller agencies working only with Negro groups. Of ten there was not enough equipment available for the field worker to stimulate the interests of large groups to participate in playground and game room activities, or there was no playground or game room. Frequently no funds were provided in the agency's budget to purchase material for groups interested in arts and crafts. Therefore, in many cases the group suffered because of lack of resource material.

Limited staff in the agency frequently limited the degree of supervision given the student. The supervisor, in some instances, was so preoccupied with other matters that the trainee was neglected. Likewise, a high rate of staff turn-over prevented the student from making a desirable adjustment during the orientation period. After reading some of the records one feels that most agencies devoted to group work and community organization among Negroes are in the same category with the Negro public schools. They must meet a gigantic problem and serve many needs with meagre means, inadequate funds and limited facilities.

---

[1] Table 7, page 48, shows the types of problems faced by students and field work supervisors.

CONCLUSIONS

This analysis is the first study that has been made of block field work in group work and community organization performed by students from the Atlanta University School of Social Work. It has been the author's objective to point out the general field work procedure and at the same time to reveal the strengths and weaknesses of certain practices.

The study has illustrated the methods by which the students become acquainted with the agency, the community and their specific responsibilities. It has described the special activities in which field workers participated as a major part of training.

The specific findings are as follows:

1. The 58 students performed all duties suggested by the field work Manual provided by the Department of Group Work at the Atlanta University School of Social Work.

2. The general content of field work was in accord with some of the field work guides to supervisors of students in group work and community organization.

3. The activities engaged in during the first three weeks of the field work period were primarily to orient the student to the program of the agency, the community and to his own specific responsibilities.

4. There was variation in the type and intensity of these activities and the pace of orientation for each student was different.

5. Each of the 58 students had some contact with groups. The relationship of the student to these groups was that of administrator, participant, or observer. The administrative type of relationship received considerably more in group work agencies emphasis than it did in community organization agencies.

6. There was a notable lack of application of group work theories on the part of field work students, in work with mass and class groups.

7. In general, office routine related to club and group assignments was over-emphasized in 14 agencies.

8. Each student performed some reading related to the program of the agency, the community, the trainee's specific duties of problems concerning the Negro.

9. Each student kept at least one type of record during the field work period.

10. Twenty-one students rendered services to individuals. This was not case work but techniques from the field of case work were employed in the form of counselling, interviewing and referral services.

11. Lack of facilities and staff limited the experiences of 17 field work students.

12. Personality difficulties constituted a problem on the part of 4 students and hindered their professional growth under supervision.

13. Nine students limited the scope and content of field work experience through lack of initiative.

14. In general, the brevity of the period prevented the students from enjoying the satisfactions as a group leader that might have been possible during a more extensive period.

These findings indicate that the content of field work in group work and community organization is largely dependent upon the program and policies of the agency, the relationship of student and supervisor, and the personality and ability of the student.

A more closely knit relationship between the school and the supervising agency is suggested by the limited experience of a few of the students.

In this way the unpromising candidate could be eliminated from the field and faulty practices of supervision could be thrashed out.

In general the study indicates that block field work in group work and community organization made a vast contribution in providing the students with an actual experience in which to employ classroom theories and techniques.

APPENDIX

CHARTS AND TABLES

TABLE 1

ACTIVITIES ENGAGED IN DURING THE ORIENTATION PERIOD AND THE NUMBER OF STUDENTS PARTICIPATING IN SUCH ACTIVITIES

The Agency	Number of Students	Number of Agencies Making Requirement
Had Conferences	54*	31
Were Required to Observe Groups	11	8
Were Required to Read	49	31
The Community		
Were Given a General Picture of the Community	19	12
Discussed Material Concerning the Agency with Supervisor	16	12
Were Required to Visit Other Agencies	16	9
The Group		
Were Required to Read	11	5
Were Required to Observe Group	10	
Were Given an Interpretation of Group	8	5

*It is probable that all of the students had conferences but 4 of the records were incomplete and therefore, did not include this particular activity.

TABLE 6

METHODS OF PUBLICITY AND THE NUMBER OF STUDENTS USING SUCH METHODS

Method	Number of Students
Public Speaking	24
Letters	25
Pamphlets	14
News Articles	9
Posters	9

TABLE 7

PROBLEMS FACED DURING THE FIELD WORK PERIOD AND THE NUMBER OF STUDENTS AND SUPERVISORS FACING SUCH PROBLEMS

Problems	No. of Supervisors	Number of Students
Limited Facilities	8	17
Limited Time	5	3
Lack of Money		5
Personal Appearance of Student		3
Attitude of Supervisor		6
Personality Difficulties on the Part of Other Person	4	2

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

Brown, Esther L. Social Work as a Profession. 3rd. ed. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1938.

Busch, Henry. Leadership in Group Work. New York: Association Press, 1943.

DuVall, Everett. Personality and Social Group Work. New York: Association Press, 1943.

Elliot, Harrison. The Process of Group Thinking. New York: Association Press, 1938.

Fink, Arthur, The Field of Social Work. New York: Henry Holt Co., 1942.

Hendry, C. E. and Zerfoss, K. A. A Professional Outlook on Group Education. New York: Association Press, 1939.

Kilpatrick, William H. Group Education for a Democracy. New York: Association Press, 1939.

Lee, Porter R. and Kenworthy, Marion. Mental Hygiene and Social Work. New York: Association Press, 1931.

Lieberman, Joshua. New Trends in Group Work. New York: Association Press, 1939.

Lindenburg, Sidney J. Supervision in Social Group Work. New York Association Press, 1939.

Simkjovitch, Mary K. Group Life. New York: Association Press, 1940.

Slavson, S. R. Creative Group Education. New York: Association Press, 1937.

Steiner, Jess F. Community Organization. New York: Appleton Century Co., 1930.

Stone, Walter L. Problems in Social Group Work, Recreational Leadership and Informal Education. Nashville: Informal Education Service,

Sullivan, Dorothea, The Practice of Group Work. New York: Association Press, 1920.

Super, Paul. Training A Staff. New York: Association Press, 1920.

Swift, Arthur L. Jr. Make Your Agency More Effective. New York: Association Press, 1941.

Tead, Ordway. Art of Leadership. New York: Whittlesey House, 1935.

Zachry, C. A. and Lightly, M. Emotion and Conduct in Adolescence. New York: Appleton Century Co. 1940.

Articles

Abbot, Edith. "Education for Social Work", Social Work Year Book, 1933.

Adler, D. L. Lippitt, R. and White R. K. "An Experiment with Young People Under Democratic, Autocratic, and Laissez-faire Atmospheres".

Proceedings of the National Conference of Social Work. 1939.

Bowman, ReRoy. "Dictatorship, Democracy, and Group Work in America". Proceedings of the National Conference of Social Work

Coyle, Grace. "Case Work and Group Work". Survey Mid-Monthly, LXXlll (April, 1937) pp. 102-103.

Coyle, Grace. "Generic Aspects of Professional Training", Proceedings of the National Conference of Social Work, 1940.

Elliot, Grace. "Importance of Maturity and a Social Philosophy for Group Leaders and Supervisors". Proceedings of the National Conference of Social Work, 1937.

Gartland, Ruth. "Cooperative Services in Case Work and Group Work". Visiting Teacher Bulletin, Vol. Xlll (June, 1938), pp. 6-11.

Hathway, Marion. "Education for Social Work", Social Work Year Book, 1941.

King, Clarence. "Community Organization for Social Work". Social Work Year Book, 1941.

Lee, Porter R. "The Social Worker and Social Action". Family, XVl (December,)1935,

Lindeman, Edward C. "Group Work and Education for Democracy". Proceedings of the National Conference of Social Work, 1942.

Moller, Elise. "Our Job as Supervisors". Womans Press (May, 1941).

Pigors, Paul. "Types of Leaders in Group Work", Sociology and Social Research, XXl (September -October) 1936.

Routzahn, Mary. "Publicity and Interpretation in Social Work", Social Work Year Book, 1941.

Sorenson, Roy. "Case Work and Group Work Integration: Its Implications for Community Planning". Proceedings of The National Conference of Social Work.

Swedsen, Margaret. "The Relationship Between Case Work and Group Work in the Interest of Individuals". Proceedings of The National Conference of Social Work, 1935.

Wanamaker, Claudia, "The Integration of Group Work and Case Work". Proceedings of The National Conference of Social Work, 1935.

Wilson, Gertrude. "Methods of Record Keeping of Group Behavior and Individual Contacts, "Proceedings of The National Conference of Social Work.

Miscellaneous Material

Atlanta University School of Social Work. Bulletin. Atlanta: Atlanta University School of Social Work. 1941-42.

Brereton, Margaretta. The General Secretary of a Community YWCA. New York: Womans Press, /n.d./

Hall, Francis Adkins, "A Selected Bibliography on Group Work". New York: American Association for the Study of Group Work, 1939.

Bernstein, Saul., Coyle, Grace and Others. Group Work: Roots and Branches. New York: Association Press, 1937.

Lyle, Betty, New Directions. New York: Womans Press, 1940.

Unpublished Material

Adams, Frankie. A Suggestive Guide to Agency Supervisors of Students in Group Work. Atlanta University School of Social Work, Atlanta: 1942.

Adams, Frankie. Field Guide for Students in Group Work. Atlanta University School of Social Work, Atlanta: 1942.

Adams, Frankie, Field Work Manual. Atlanta University School of Social Work, Atlanta: 1937.

Coyle, Grace. Letter, March 8, 1944.

Western Reserve University, School of Applied Social Sciences. Group Work Field Experience. Cleveland, Ohio: 1944.